Must Remain in
Transcription Room

Now what do we talk about? Last week you remember we left with some ideas about Work, and maybe you did something and maybe we can talk about that, or any other questions you wish, it doesn't matter.

Q: George Bloch: I'd like to ask a question about modern science, what we call modern science, that is Chemistry, these other disciplines. Where do the laws obtained by these methods fit in the total.....

Mr. Nyland: What law for instance, are you referring to?

George: Let's say the law of Thermo-dynamics for example or the second law of Thermodynamics, or what I'm thinking of is just any law that has been obtained in ordinary means by observations and then some statement is made that seems to be consistent with all the observations made. Oh, like specificity of enzymes in a body or Biochemistry of DNA synthesis and the whole body - this vast body of information. I have a feeling that it's probably very relative. Well, before I thought it was not too relative, that is, it was a body of knowledge which pragmatically the only way I could understand explained the functioning of the world as we know it.

Mr. Nyland: I still don't know which side of the fence you're going to junk.

George: Well I don't know either.

Mr. Nyland: Well then you can't blame me. Laws of Chemistry and Physics, electronics, electricity, magnetism, and so forth, have to do primarily with physical phenomena. What we talk about has to do with psychological phenomena, and sometimes, when the psychology is expressed by means of physical behavior, it may be that the physical behavior as a state of matter may have a certain requirement, to be used for the expression of such psychological data. Otherwise, I do not see any conflict. If there's conflict on the basis of physical science - but the assumption, as you know as far as Gurdjieff is concerned, is that everything is material. Physically speaking in of course exact science, I don't think there's any objection.

Physiologically, as far as man is concerned, when he is receiving impressions through his sense organs, there's no conflict. When man is conscious, self-conscious and cosmic-conscious, that is only on the basis of a psychological development. And exact science, as such, doesn't touch it. Psychology would, if it were interested. Psychiatry is partly inbetween, because it applies certain methods, partly medical, partly in a certain situation, sometimes by my introduction of - in extreme cases - hypnotism. But whatever happens in the present world, scientific, astrolotical, astronomy, cosmological, physiological, algebraelogiaal, all of that - I don't see any particular conflict. So my question is, if you know of any particular conflict, let's talk about that.

George: Well, I'm not sure this is a conflict but, well, in the little Work that I have done, I get the impression that those phenomena which I have before studied scientifically now really for the first time, really become objective.

Mr.Nyland: I don't think they do.

George: Well, perhaps just a little bit.

Mr. Nyland: No, I don't think so. I don't think so. I think they remain subjective because I think all the phenomena you study in chemistry , for instance, are still subjectively tinted because of interpretation of the research man. There are certain facts that could become absolute. And they can be accepted by everybody regardless of their interpretation; and, as you know, sometimes you use that kind of example, melting point and so forth. You remember that?

George: I wasn't thinking of that. I was thinking of just the observation that - like, let's start with the contraction of a certain muscle can cause, let's say, this finger tip to bend and would unbend, understandably. Through the data that this finger bends because of contraction of a certain muscle or set of muscles and then, at least in my case, I would hesitate and try to figure out which muscles were involved ( ).

Mr. Nyland: Are you now talking on the basis of Gurdjieff?

George: No, before.

Mr. Nyland: . . . Or physiological science? Which is all right? It continues, doesn't it?

George: Yes, it continues.

Mr. Nyland: Well, what is more objective about it?

George: Oh, the actual law is no more and no less objective.

Mr.Nyland: Just a statement of fact and an explanation. Surely it is not an objective fact, and only if it would be acknowledged by everybody that that is an explanation then it is acceptable by that. But you know how long we hang onto working hypotheses before you make an axiom.

George: Not true.

Mr.Nyland: An axiomatic would be objectivityl But then you go into the philosophy of science. Not the exact science as we know it. But that one is, for instance, in becoming interested in work of this kind, will look at the different results which science claims or has even achieved, or the reason for the research, in a little different way - of course there's no doubt. You probably will look at your body in a different way. But as far as Work on oneself is concerned, it doesn't make any difference. I may look at my body in a different way, and explain it in a different way. When it comes to the point of objectivity, all the body has to do is to exist. And all that is required is observation. No more, not even with an explanation because I am not interested in it. Impartiality is not interested in explaining or in classifying even. And all of science is based upon explanation of facts. And if we can classify them and give them a name, we are very happy. No, you have to be more clear about it if there is a conflict as far as your own thinking is concerned.

George: There is a conflict. ( ) I mean I haven't thought well enough to be able to formulate it clearly.

Steve Joseph: Mr.Nyland, since this has come up, I have a few questions along this line I'd like to ask. One of them, which came up in

Steve Joseph: Mr.Nyland, since this has come up, I have a few questions along this line I'd like to ask. One of them, which came up in reading the Oragean Version, C. Daly King talks of the phrases "feeding the moon", that I am "food for the moon". And he talks of this in a way which leads me to feel that he is implying that it would be possible for me to, using the methods of ordinary science, to verify this. Also, sometimes you in speaking of, for example, creating the Kesdjan body, talk about using the so-called inert gases, gases with the complete ( ); and again, the question in my mind is - I've heard you saying this and other things of this sort have come up - is this a statement which I am to take as something which could conceivably be verified by the ordinary methods of physical science?

Mr.Nyland: Well, now you're going to go on very difficult ground. For instance, there are many statements made of that kind that are used for the explaining of certain phenomena. And that partly they can be verified and partly they are logical deductions. When one talks about inert gases, for instance, which can be digested on a different kind of a plane, I think it's based on the logicality of what is inert. And that one would assume that there is a possibility of attacking them with a differend kind of a method, not a method which exists on earth. For a verification of it, you would have to have an instrument of a man who is conscious and takes in air: and then, verifying it by means of an analysis, of actually some helium or zenon or so forth, left in his body; practically impossible. In the first place, there is no conscious man. In the second place, I think there is impossibility of separating the gases that are in him which probably are, by that time, in accordance with theory, digested.

So, as long as it is a logical explanation, it serves also as a working hypothesis. And the assumption is then that it is true until it has been proved that it isn't. And to prove that it isn't is just as difficult as to prove that it is. You see, this whole business of reasoning things out and coming to a theory which is helpful for oneself; as long as the theory does not interfer with the result which can be obtained in a practical way, the theory has a perfect right to exist. B ut if there are facts that are practical, they are

practically verifyable, that one knows it is so, as a fact and so forth- that that would include then looking at the theory, which then might hold water, that would be a difficulty. But as far as I know, so far there is nothing. If I say the activity of the mind when one tries to build an objective faculty takes place in a section of the brain which is virgin field and is situated above the temple, well, to some extent it's possible to verify. In the first place, as far as the knowledge of the brain is concerned, there is actually a certain section like that which is not used at all and for which there is at the present no physiological explanation. That is as far

is that if there is something going on, like building an objective faculty, there ought to be some kind of activity. And the verification for anyone who works is that it may be imagination, but nevertheless the statement is made that he can become aware of a certain activity. Now if one is very good at that kind of verification, you can put your fingers about the temple and say, "Yes, I feel it." But again, you see, it doesn't do any harm to the rest of the functioning of the brain. Because apparently, even if that objective faculty is being built, it does not harm the rest of the brain from functioning. So there is no evil in the theory. As far as the statement that, for instance, energies that are received by means of sense organs do not reach the place where they usually go, but might go to the subconscious, it would be very difficult to indicate where is the subconscious. And even Freud couldn't say. Still we have talked about it; something that is in existence, which apparently must be there, and which we sometimes will know by the performance it will give, but never could pin it down where it actually was. And of course there are many theories where such a subconscious may be that it may be the hypothalamus. But I have as much right to say that it is in this

particular virgin field where the subconscious could become conscious. Andagain, one theory matched against the other I have no particular preference of one or the other, unless it's in the field of practical results.

Now, let's see. The question of si-do. The loosening up of the bondag bondage between centers. That is also something that could perhaps be verified when it is actually shown that the functionings of the different centers can start to function independently of each other. That would mean a loosening up, Now this verification is very close to an experience of sleep when, because of a certain restful period, or period of relaxation, the centers are not connected as much as when you fall asleep. Early in the morning, they are separated. It also means that if they are not connected, they don't function in a coordinating sense like we know in ordinary life. Again, it can be verified when people wake up - they're not all there. And for some it takes a little while before they are really connected. You see. Now, that can be explained in a variety of different ways. You could say, yes, the blood circulation is a little sluggish but the nervous system is not yet present to a man. Or whatever way you want to indicate it, it's alright. You can also say, "I still have too much sleep in my eyes". So, one can put another theory right next to it again, it is not in contradiction to any of the known facts; it's quite alright. And I think an indication that it may be the loosening up of certain what are at the present time relationships between the centers, and sometimes completely separated from each other, it would indicate that the physical body can exist by itself without being affected by either the feeling or the mind. And that it is quite definitely possible that one has a feeling as an experience, without an expression in the body. The whole problem of hibernation [illegible] for instance, could come under that. What is taking place in hiberna-

tion is simply a continuation, by means of a very low form of breathing., that the blood is being fed in order to maintain the body. There is absolutely no impressions coming in either through the mind or through the feeling. And, as a result, the totality of that what is life has been reduced to an utter minimum, nevertheless it continues to exist. As good a theory as any other.

Now, different psychological as well as physiological affects on a person as a result of Work - that, I think, can be verified. And then it can be ascribed to Work, and it can be ascribed to a variety of other factors. But I think that if one takes the five rules of Objective Morality and would adhere, particularly, to the first three, nobody can go wrong. The theories as hypnotism, where Beelzebub as professional hypnotist - I think they can be verified. As a matter of fact, they are based actually on one's - how hypnotism started, you remember. What was the name: ( )

Someone: Mesmer.

Mr.Nyland: Yes, Mesmer, and people of that kind. I think it is verifiable enough to see that atleast whatever Gurdjieff says about it is in line with what people think. Now, if you come to other aspects of it, cosmology, the relationship between the different planetary bodies, the solar systme, Milky Ways, and so forth, that kind of gradation, if you want to verify it, I think you'll have a terrible time. That there are solar systems - that I think is gradually acknowledged. The question of an expanding universe I think is also in line with what Gurdjieff has said about it. The concept of omnipresent and omniscience, omnipotence and so forth, of course are very old concepts. The question of infinity as against finite things, naturally already has existed as long as man has lived.

The question of a world within a world, microcosmosms and macrocosms, so above, so below - I think that's also a very old concept

which nobody will question. The question now regarding moon, the feeding of the moon, the place of earth in relation to other bodies, or the place where earth is now in its own solar system, and the solar system, and the place that it occupies regarding the Cosmic Ray; the assumption that the Cosmic Ray exists - I don't think there is any particular objection. Because I can assume that that what I from this standpoint on earth look at, I look towards the Sun Absolute; if I look in the direction of our present sun and then imagine the Milky Way as another solar system in back of it until finally I say His Endlessness; when I understand the terminology of His Endlessness, then of course it does not mean it is at the end of that line, it means It Is.

Now if I look the other way, towards the moon, and then the assumption of Anulios; now, there are several theories about that. And some you will find in Descartes - where is the moon balanced? And the assumption is that there is something else on the other side of the moon. These are old theories that already have existed for quite sometime. And never been proved in order to explain how the moon circulates around the earth. It is interesting that, as far as the moon is concerned, the surface of the moon is always turned towards us; we never see the other side. And that in order to make that possible, that something else has to be on the other side which affects it. And that the rotation of the moon around its axis, being exactly the same as the twenty eight days when it goes around the earth, is also a very interesting fact. So the explanation sometimes is by means of Anulios and one says that's on the other side and that then becomes the growing end of the Cosmic Ray.

The theory of involution and evolution I think is an old one. The question of different levels of being as far as earth going up towards infinity is concerned is also theosophically of course extremely old.

If you know enough about theosophy it is of seven worlds within worlds and so forth. Then if you come to this question of omniscience or the question of omnipresence, it would indicate that man, as representing a certain form of life on earth, should have within himself also his own world. So that then the reality between macrocosm and microcosm could be proved if man understood his own world. And if the laws that govern his own world exist for him, then all you have to do is by extrapolation to apply them to the cosmos.

Now the question then is: if I assume that, cosmologically speaking there are different planets and the sun and the moon and Anulios, where is man now in regard to his own world and is there in man - Sun,Planets,Earth,Moon and Anulios? If that were so, then I have within man as he is or perhaps as he is potentially a proof that the world as such exists in which man, as man, as a body, representing first that particular system is also exactly the same place as where the earth is in reality connected with the Cosmic Ray. So now I have to prove that psychologically. And I have to assume that that what is understood by certain concepts of what I now call physical body or emotional or intellectual, that that could be represented by certain configurations which, astrologically and according to astronomy, are called planets and sun. And of course ( ) quite easily, the planets are emotion, the sun is the head, earth is the body. Where is the moon? That's a very interesting question: where is the moon in man? And what is it - Anulios? And the moon is not a body on its own, it only exists as reflected light. What is there in man that is not his own and is only reflected.

I don 't want to give you the answer to that beeause it is more interesting to try to find it. Well then the same question is: where is Anulios in man? Where is this growing factor in man? Where is

the possibility for him to discover in himself something that could, starting from that point, help the evolution of man? H ow can that what is now, I call it, the growing point as Anulios, in man comparable to man what it is as something growing which is a form of life for him? Where is this life in man that is causing man to grow in the direction of freeing that what is life in him? That is really, philosophically, the particular thought that one is interested in. And if I say now: yes, that is magnetic center, as a form of life, it can be perfectly practical theory, provided I now can prove that when it starts to evolve as man, and as man starts to fulfill his function and his obligations, that then magnetic center starts to create life and then it has to go through, you might call it, the layer of the womb. It has to go through earth as body which, in an evolutionary scale, would have to be promoted to the next level. You understand what I mean by that because, if I assume that Anulios is growing and something else is formed on the other side of Anulios, Anulios becomes the moon, the moon becomes the earth, the earth becomes a planet, the planet becomes Sun. They all move up. If I sat, counting - one-two-three- the number two becomes three.

The same way with man. If he understands his physical body, the next step would be the possibility of an immortal body. So the point is - If I wish to evolve, something in me starts to grow which becomes equivalent for my living quarters so that I may leave my body for whatever it is and move forward to the Kesdjanian. What takes place in the meantime is that what is magnetic center, is an expression of my life which is now in the essential essence, which would become essence for me. It is the life giving force which gradually moves up from the physical body to the Kesdjan, to the soul. And that the next level of evolution would mean that the planets would become sun. In the same way as what I now assume that the physical body, and

Gurdjieff calls it "unfortunate planet" and which in many ways in olden literature, as you know, also has it considered like that - that is, the moon in relation to that ( ) and so forth, has a very definite meaning. That it kept, as it were, the earth in the place that it was. And that the unfortunate part of the earth, cosmologically speaking is that it happens to be at Fa of the octave. And that man with his body, his earth body, his natural development, is in his own development with a body at Fa in his own scale.

Now so far I don't see that there is anything that is contradictory to any other kind of a system or theory. And that it will give, when one starts to look at it this way, much more elucidation of what is actually taking place and that it then connects and combines many different theories in one and because of that, there seems to be as far as the Gurdjieff system is concerned, a great deal of unity.

But we live and learn. Whenever we discover something that cannot be explained and that then, because of the non-explanation - but that then Gurdjieff might have an explanation for it - it would be very interesting then to verify that by the exact scientists. B ut of course they won't do it beaause they won't even take the explanations as ( ), as simply saying - oh well, that is old wive's tales. Unless it is something that comes out of their own brain or their own ( ) and that makes them of course Hasnamusian. You might say it's too bad but nevertheless that happens to be the case.

Whenever the conflict, so-called, comes up I always ask: what is the conflict? Do you know it? And honestly, I don't. And I don't see any particular possibility for it and surely I'm interested because I8m a scientific man. I've studied enough; there's that kind of a thing to know and if there were any at the present time anything that I believe is not in conformity to what G urdjieff is saying surely.

Now if you take Ouspensky, who is also a good scientific man - mathematician - and he goes a little bit overboard by calling them hydrogens and not oxygens and so forth - and the tables and to give them numbers and then comes to the conclusion that the numbers are too big and divides them by two and then, that is still too big and divides them again by two; if you put it on the basis of relativity, it's quite right. But all it means is a division between certain things that are on one level and another level. Now in order to distinguish them, Ouspensky loves to use the figures 12 or 24 or 6 or 3, simply basing it on t on the triunity which can come out of three and can become one. And then simply twice as much is 6, twice as much is twelve and so you can get very nice rounded figures which may mean something or not. But when the statement is made, there are forty-eight laws on earth, I don't think Ouspensky himself ever has counted them. And what are those laws? Physical laws? And that the next level only has 24? The planetary level? And where do the other twelve go? You know, if you divide 48, you get 24 - that's right. Twenty-four are lost - or were they made because the 48 pairs then became one and there were only 24 left? And where are they? What kind of a law? Is the law of gravity one of them? You see, I think with that one reaches a little too much theory and also a little too much nonsense. It sounds very good.

For instance, this table of the thirty thousand. It's absolutely inaccurate. But if that relationship is exactly thirty thousand, he cannot verify and nobody else can.

The explanation of the enneagram. Also subject to exactly the same kind of an ( ); and Daly King also falls for that kind of stuff. I can make a theory that will conform to that what I call facts but that doesn't mean it's a working hypothesis. It has absolutely no worth; ~~it is a working hypothesis. It has absolutely no~~/ nobody can explain the enneagram where it goes over inbetween point six and point nine - that

there is all of a sudden a hiatus which, of course, Ouspensky loves to explain with a little bridge and then ( ). It doesn't work that way. If one wants to study the enneagram and then try to insert into it an opening we know that between five and four that it cannot be overbridged. And only going through the one-four-two-eight-five-seven up above. But there is no direct connection between four and five. One-four-two-eight- you have to go across, up on two. Then you come down to five, then you go up to seven. Now what the meanings are of these one-four-two-eight-five-seven - I say one-seven is still the law of phenomena - good. Then there is that nine-three and six - the law of triunity - also good. They cross at certain points, and always cross two lines; when you go from nine to three, you cross two lines.. When you go from one to four, you again cross two lines - this time it's a triangle. What is the meaning? You can sit for a long time in front of the enneagram and try to understand it as a symbol. And when you don't usually one says it isn't there. And that sometimes people who know a little more say Yes, it is in there but you won't know it. Until you have dveloped sufficiently so that you can understand the symbol. It's always that way with symbolism. And one never can really judge about it. You never can question someone ( ) about it. You never can question someone. But when it becomes practical as say ( ), then it's really nonsensical.

Now there is something fundamental about the question of chemistry, and when the question of chemistry comes up, we talk about it in exact scientific terms. It is limited. Gurdjieff tries to explain that cosmic chemistry takes in the properties, not only of matter, but also of psychological conditions. And that there is undoubtedly a chemistry of relationships. And that on that kind of a basis, he

happens to use nitrogen-oxygen as some of the gaseous states which have a certain atomic weight in relation to each other and that out of the three, which happen to be very close together as you know, carbon, oxygen and nitrogen sixteen; that out of the combination, hydrogen ( ). Now, what is the meaning of hydrogen? It's not hydrogen, chemically speaking, number one of the periodic system. Hydrogen happens to be the result of the combination of the three others in which hydrogen is representing a state. Whereas the other three are representing forces. Well, if you look at that kind of chemistry now from the standpoint of this explanation as something which is really psychologically true, you come then to an activity as positive, negative, neutralizer. Then of course it's quite a different story. And the result of the neutralizer when it enters into a new level, becoming then hydrogen - it's an interesting ' it's an interesting concept. But again, to prove it: who can? So then anybody is quite entitle d to use the words they want to use, provided they explain. Ouspensky is not sure what he is explaining. I think that Gurdjieff talks in Purgatory quite definitely about the three-force rhythm rising in the next step in digestion and so forth. All of that I think can be understood very well. It may be not so easy to be understood and sometimes may go a little against understanding we have of physiology but again, about physiology, there are many theories: should you drink cold water before a meal or not? You go to one doctor, and you go to another. . .

No, it is interesting when you want to look at it and study it. There are without any question spiritual laws and that they are comparable to those what I call physical laws - attraction is one for instance; gravity is another; density is another; vibration is another; all these things exist in material sense and they exist in spiritual sense and in order to explain them further, one can certainly say that

the density of matter, when it starts to expand a little bit, will gradually change over to a different kind of configuaration, a different kind of set of properties and still can remain material. Where to draw the line? There is no line. One said. The other said to end the line, to draw the line, when does it become non-matter? Here he has a very hard time saying where it is. It is between twelve and six or is it between twenty four and twelve? Where is the difference? If I say good: here I know, solid, liquid, gas. Now gas expands further. What is it now? Well, it is so that I can't see it any more. And still that I know it exists. Let's say a form of moisture which is carried by air and which is not condensed which is, so-called the (longitude) point. Is it there or not? Yes, I can verify it because if I am awake I know I can take that kind of air out of it - that kind of water out of the air.

Now, the next step. Electrons and electricity. We know they must exist because there are the results. You have light and everything that is due to that kind of a condition - in some way material surely. The study of the atom and electrons and all the rest indicates that there is something in it. And when you try to define, saying what is an electron - what causes electricity? Well an electron is an electron. It happens to be electricity. What is electricity? It is not an ( ). You see, you don't get very far that way.

Now, what is magnetism!? -and what is attraction? What is the attraction at a distance? What is the influence of magnetism at a distance? When I talk about an effect of one person upon anthoer, what is the attraction between people? When they are still enough apart, what is this particular force that happens to be generated in a certain a certain way because of a certain molecular construction? Why is it that I am ( )? Why is wood not magnetic? Why are there certain matters that are and others that are not? Because of the different way they are built - yes, of course. If one continues to build it, you come to a point where

they are radioactive and they break down. Is that one of the laws of earth? The law of destruction? Is a law of magnetism one? Ethereal qualities: what we like to use in ordinary physics, you know as ether. Ether, the stuff that interpenetrates and it is available everywhere. Still, you never can lay your hands on it. It has a certain substance, even, they call it: like ( ) at a time when we didn't know anything about combustion. Like at the present time in the body, in this material form. If I look at the body as a
is more empty space than there are molecules. Still they are held together: I call it cohesion. Attraction between heterogeneous materials is called adhesion. Like glue, sticking to paper.

You see, all these different concepts, when you get to a little bit of finer density, less materiality, they still remain to exist in principle but they are not like us, phenomena visible to the human eye. And still, I must admit that they exist because I can see the results. I can say: I am limited with my eyes: I can only see the spectrum. It surely doesn't mean that there are no infrared rays or ultraviolet. I know one is hot, and the other is affecting a photographic plate. Still they must exist at a certain point, even if I don't know it. So therefore, if I am the kind of person I am, how will I know about densities that are outside of my range? Then only by assuming that they exist and I can never verify them. Can't you understand that there must be something that is not verifiable? Because we are limited? You can take a microscope the way it used to be set up and it went up to a certain point and then the Brownian movement of the molecules prevent you from looking at it further. Until we got an oscilloscope. It was already much better. Now we have an electronic microscope also. And still there are limitations to whatever material is being used -- glass or some form of plastic, because of the impression of the ray.

You see, you never can see around a corner. And there are certain things that are absolutely closed to human beings the same way, as you know a dog can hear a sound we cannot hear. These are the things that are outside our physical world. And to try to judge about them from the standpoint of ordinary physics is, of course, idiotic. To try to judge about them by something that I call psychology, and I don't even know the workings of the brain or what is taking place with the little electrons that are there when they are touched by a visual ray or by a sound - that I cannot explain it in any other way than that it is a tremendously complicated computer. I would assume it is quite right and no further, I come to a point and say up to this point - no further.

So I think that if one could assume this on the basis of what we know, and then will admit that there is a limit to that kind of knowledge, I think we're on the standpoint of Gurdjieff. Because he definitely said there is a limit in mother nature. There's a limit to human beings. And whether we like it or not, we still think that by means of constantly investigating further and further, that we will uncover life. Or that I must be able to ( ). Also stupid.

You see, philosophically, again, if there is evolution it is a question when one level is different from another what makes the difference? In accordance with the old Darwinian theory, evolution of the species and the origin, that simply by the continuation of certain species in its own development, that gradually all the different phenomena of nature - animals, plants and so forth - could be explained. And that was very good as a working hypothesis for quite some time. Wallace questioned it a little bit but the person who really questioned it was Reese. And he came up with his mutation theory. It's interesting you see because apparently there are new species formed without reverting back to the original. This is - I would say it's the first time that this is an indication of a certain stepwise chain. And that evolution is not in a direct line, but is stepwise. And that kind of an explanation

becomes, of course, much and much more important when you look at the natural phenomena the way they are. If you study an electron, electrons and an atom, and electrons around a nucleus, you know there are layers. And the difference between one layer and another is so many quanta. And when (Plant) brought that out in thermodynamics, it was like an eye opener for the explanation of certain phenomena which could not be explained. Nothing will take on a direct line. It will always be step-wise. But because of our distance away from it, it sometimes looks like a line.

Now if one starts to see this as layers, as different planes of existence, then one also knows that on one plane, as compared to a higher or to a lower, certain different properties must exist. That of course is the meaning of saying that there are twelve laws of twenty four, but it doesn't help if I don't define them. Buf if I say there is a difference in layer between earth and planets and again, between planets and sun, then I've indicated that there is a step and that the vertical line, without making any progress is going in the direction of a development of a new kind of level and that the reason for a step menas that on the next step something else exists which did not exist before. This is the introduction of a new something into the possibility of development on account of which the line which goes straight is broken, goes up in a different direction, until it has outlived you might say its energy, when it then starts to level off again as a step. These kind of concepts are extremely important for a possible development of man and they are in existence as far as the cosmology is concerned.

If you take the earth, and the planets and the sun, there is quite definitely a difference between the levels of being, so-called. If you take man, physically, emotionally, intellectually, there is a different level of being. But man, now, as an ordinary waking/sleeping person or a sleeping, physically, person and going to the next step of self-consciousness, the introduction of that which is new, which

does not exist on the earth and which can exist on the level of self-consciousness, kk is objectivity. And again, if one looks at it that way, then objectivity becomes a logical assumption. Philos-ophically, again, or historically, or everything that is mystical, everything that exists as esoteric knowledge is based on exactly the introduction of something that could not have been foreseen and that constantly was the search of the Old Truth, like the Holy Grail, trying to find where it is. You know, and the old cabala will give you many many ( ) of that kind. Where is the sacred ( ). Sometimes in words, sometimes in letters, that what is behind it, and that which sometimes, cannot be pronounced.

So, well, it is all nice kind of theory: your question wandered on, but it's good thing to try to put silence in the proper place in regard to the ideas o f Gurdjieff. And as long as one can confess that he is interested in the ideas of objectivity ---(is that Halloween Days again?) Tell them we're busy.)

You might almost say that the region in which Gurdjieff operates is not the physical body and that anything which has to do with pure physical does not touch, The only way it could be touched is whenever there is psychological phenomena which has to be put in a certain form and when we talk about behavior, that then we are down again to the level of ordinary physics, material forms which can be seen or observed - that then the only way, in order not to get into trouble, is to consider them as an object only. And that the ques-tion of impartiality then becomes absolutely necessary in order to aboid all kinds of expectations.

I would almost say it is very clever you see. Because if I'm afraid of something I would set up a certain law that would prevent me from mixing that what I'm afraid of. And that is really what happens.

If I'm afraid of subjectivity or I consider subjectivity a danger, the only way to eliminate it is to make it objective. And that would mean immediately that everything that is subjective I have to consider impartially.

That is as far as matter is concerned. As far as time is concerned, it's about the same thing because it operates in space, the same way, but for that I have to assume that that what exists must exist at the moment without being subject to any dimension of time. And the dimension of time for me, when I'm subjective are past and future. Because they are lines, lines of time. And that the only time that could become objective for me is the moment. So there you have instantaneity - you have simultaneity, the moment ( ), the Zen principles, if one understands them - all these things belong of course to that and, as I say, as far as Gurdjieff is concerned, in the particular system is very clear. It doesn't touch any of the subjective elements. Because nobody will talk about impartiality or non-identification because all of ordinary life is absolute identification, and partiality.

So you see, it starts where one leaves off. And the possibility of evolution is to take that what is potential on earth and never on earth will become actual which - then - by means of certain ways of how to Work are going to be changed into an actuality. But as far as mother earth is concerned, it will not become any actuality at all - it will remain potential and it will die like that.

Now, what other questions are there because we are going to theorize from now until Doomsday. It's no good. You must not allow yourself too much like I do.

Jerry Lindsay: Well, maybe this is again more theory but these statements lead me to ask what is the purpose of death and its meaning?

Mr.Nyland: Oh, darling. With that kind of a question you force me again into a lecture. You see because I cannot immediately say that is that without giving a background. I can make a statement. I can say,Yes, it is in order to become free. B ut it has absolutely no meaning because you don't know where the concept belongs. Death we know - of the physical body - is that the physical body ~~is free and then from what? Not from earth. Because it remains in the earth;~~ it's free and then what? Not from earth. Because it remains in the earth; it's even buried. Not free from destruction; it continues to be destroyed. It continues to have matter as it is in the body changed into different forms actually going over into liquid conditions and gaseous conditions and evaporation. So you see, that kind of a freedom, when I say that it is freedom that one wishes, what is that that wishes to be free? Life. And why? Why should life be on earth not free, wishing to become free? You mig ht say to some extent it is a very difficult problem to solve because we don't know anyth ing about life and we don't make it. You can say it happens. And that what we consider life as existing also on three different levels of man and animals and plants, all representing a different form of life meaning by that that there is a possibility of continuation of that when it is properly fed. Now what is the purpose? Again, cosmologically it happens to be as organic kingdom on earth which will mean for the earth a certain possibility of evolving and involving when life as such by mankind - represented by mankind - can be used as a transforming station for certain matters, evolutionary, coming from above. Again a contradiction in terms because infinity is not above-infinity is all over - going into another negative absolute - which is also idiotic because if it's absolute it can never be negative. So we have already such a difficulty in finding the proper words and concepts that when one starts to talk about life you have much more

trouble defining what it is. And where is it? And does life actually wish to be free? Can it have a wish?

So you have to have an assumption of some kind in order to make it clear why certain things happen on earth the way we see it or at least the way we experience it. And the assumption is that the wish - it depicts it as a wich - a tendency which may exist of the totality of everything existing is to become one. That would be an explanation of the word infinity. Because infinitmy would mean without dimension. And the only way I can at the present time imagine anything without dimension is only when it is a point. Or a moment as far as time goes. They are no doubt identical concepts.

So when one wants to talk now about freedom it is this form of life which we know as human being - to be free from the form so that it can unite with that what is the totality of everything existing and becoming one with it. So that that what is the totality of everything existing and becoming one with it. So that a human being as life represents now a part of life but life being without dimension is only when it is a point. Or a moment as far as time goes. They are no doubt identical concepts.

So when one wants to talk now about freedom it is this form of life which we know as a human being - to be free from the form so that it can unite with that what is the totality of everything existing and becoming one with it. So that a human being as life represents now a part of life but life without dimension is simply encased in something that is now considered the body or a certain prison. And that event at the moment when life is so-called born, in the form of a child, or conceived - that at that moment life is put in a form and at that moment, almost I would say rebels and wishes for the death of the body. It's a very interesting idea you see. But it is much more than that because you see - why is life that way and what happens after death?

Where is this life goin, which now carries your name, my name? What is the purpose of, the meaning of existence? What is really life in one and what remains for oneself the possibility of controllihg and affecting it?

If you look at death as something that releases a possibility of life and we give it a little name - like ectoplasm or spiritual values or something that can exist without a body, that hovers around the earth for forty days and perhaps longer - the old concepts of recurrence and reincarnation - how can one explain them? Do they still exist and can be called upon? Like extrasensory perception and clairvoyance definitely prove. Psychical research is far enough advanced to have facts of that kind. So they cannot be denied. And there must be an existence which we then call another world: sometimes it is called heaven because it is not earth and sometimes we consider it that it is still necessary for such poor little souls- we call them that - to continue to exist in order to work out their own salvation.

And many theories are there: purgatory or hell or heaven. And who goes to heaven? And can one, from heaven, return to earth? Again the same question of death of course is linked up with what is the question before birth? Where is that life? It's easy enough to say father and mother and one can say yes, sperm, ova, this is life. But it is already that life that is at that time imprisoned? Again you see it's very interesting because that in man is free. Physiologically speaking, we know enough about it to know it is free, and that never anything happens to the imprisonment until you happen to be together and are in conception the formation of a child. Then it is imprisoned. Before that, it is as free as apple blossoms. And some of the apple blossom never becomes a fruit. Some of the sperm never become a child; some of the eggs, never. The whole idea of menstrua-

tion and so forth, it's quite interesting to see how that is constantly renewed. And that what is simply discharged becomes at that moment something that is exactly the same as seed that falls in nnnfertile soil.

Now you see - that is life that exists in man and when he grows up to maturity and his sex organs become developed he has the possibility of usage of certain material that is there in him of life giving force. And there are two ways by which it can be used; One, ordinary procreation, the continuation of the forms of imprisonment. You see, interesting because it remains then imprisoned in another next generation, and for a definite puppose - to help maintain the earth to stay where it is. It does not function in any other way and as far as sex energy is concerned it is simply utilized for the maintenance of the place of mankind.

The second way of using such energy is for real creation. Real creation means that something has to be formed which does not exist now and when it is th e task of man to create for himself that energy will be used for the creation of his Kesdjanian body and his soul body. And that would be the use in order to free his life energy for the purpose of, by means of Kesdjan and by means of Soul, to become free from the bondage of earth.

So now we are again at the death point. What happens at death? What remains? We know physical body does not remain; it is destroyed. Emotional body? H ow much? The do-re-mi, sure. That is natural. A little bit of that remains. It may not be much developed because the do-re-mi of so-called Kesdjan is really only that what is in man interested in the possibility of evolution. In that sense it represents feeling and fxdefinitely the possibility for emotion when it has to do with his own development in the direction away from earth. As an ordinary function, emotionally speaking, the do-re-mi, of

Kesdjan has no particular value. That is taking xxx care of the sol-la-si of the physical body. That is where sol and la represent intellect and emotion and feeling for the maintenance of the body. So the do-re-mi, is really, as I've called it many times, man numbef four - interested in the possibility of five, six and seven. What happens when man Works? He starts to develop in three different directions. Exactly because that what is do-of intellect is not developed as yet that it can grow into soul and the do-level of intellect is at the same height as the si-do of physical.

So that then the totality of evolution can be considered as the continuation of man as he is physically into a Soul body. And the Soul body belongs to an area of consciousness, self-consciousness at least in the beginning, and ordinary unconsciousnessxxxx as far as his physical xxxbody is concerned. If one starts to erect a Soul body on top of physical and the physical body is dropped out and the Soul is not as yet fully developed, the Soul will disappear.

So as a matter of fact you might say helping the evolution and to make it a possibility, the stpping stone was not invented but was simply made a necessity. The stepping stone is a mediator between man - what he is physically, that is his personality, and what could become his Soul. That is Kesdjan.Kesdjan starts at the point where 'fa' of the physical xxx starts and runs, do-re-mi, parallel to sol-la-si of the physical body. The cohtinuation of Kesdjan as emotional body is of course sol-la-si. It runs xxxxx parallel to the beginning of Soul which is at do-re-mi. So that if you put the do-re-mi on top of si-do of physical, Kesdjan becomes the connecting between halfway physical and halfway Soul. So that if Kesjan can be developed, then Soul can grow out from the point of la because the si-do of Kesdjan is at the same level as fa of the Soul body. You understand ( ).

That is the mediator between the two and Kesdjan has now only very - I would almost say call it inferior - but a very necessary function. And it is still temporary. So Kesdjan still remains subject to certain laws of destruction. It has to be destroyed in order to bring the soul to freedom from earth. The limitations for Kesdjan as an emotional body are on a different kind of a scale compared to the physical existence. And it is in connection with time, which is different on Kesdjanian level; the connection as far as its own lifetime is concerned is of course as compared to the physical life and that what is required as death for Kesdjan is of course also on a higher scale. Nevertheless, Kesdjan must die.

Now that quantity of material which can remain in existence after death of the physical body can be represented by the do-re-mi of that what is the beginning of Kesdjan and do, in as far as it has a desire or an interest or an actual knowledge of the potentiality of man. The development of man depends on entirely on how much he has worked. When he has worked three things have happened. It has helped him to loosen the si-do of the physical body. It will give him freedom when he dies. It will have a chance to overbridge, at Kesdjan, the fa state and go into the sol-la-si: aspiration and silence. It has a possibility of the development of do-re-mi of soul: observation, participation, experimentation; up to fa. That's all. Because now what a man should become really is sol-la-si of his soul because that's the permanency. But all the matter that can be formed during a man's lifetime when he works will remain in existence and will help the formation of Kesdjan body which again will die but which, nevertheless, can be contaced from earth and which will still have an interest in earth. And this is the whole psychic research about: that there are many so-called souls which have gone over into another world ~~with w~~

with whom a contact is made and who, in their stages, still remember where they came from, have contact with human beings on Earth, although they themselves have lost their appearance of physical body and many times in such descriptions you know that souls that have so-called gone over are very young, young looking have material forms which are quite definitely ethereal from our standpoint, material from their standpoint and have an ability of presence without us seeing them. I don't know how much literature you know about that but those are facts that I mention to you.

That is recurrence. That means a man still can recur and be in contact with Earth. Reincarnation is different. That belongs to further development of Soul into the sol-la-si. That means that at the point where that fa is of Soul, it is the point nine of the enneagram. It is the entry into the new cycle - if you put it down you can see it - that the last part, sol-la-si, is already the indication of the second going around from nine to three. It is in a new cycle of the spiral. The first spiral indicates only solar system. Do-re-mi belongs to that solar system but is not permanent regarding Soul. It still can revert back to do. Sol-la-si of that scale, as Soul, is permanent and is then outside the solar system of ours and need not return anymore to earth. But reincarnation can occur when for some reason or other there may be either a command or a desire on the part of such Souls to return to earth as a messenger. And that we call reincarnation of Krishna or whoever may be in the form of a human being.

That also a little bit of an in-between state, the suffering of which human beings have after death, realizing that they have not done in this life what they should have done - the idea of Purgatory - the idea of having again to earn their living - again maybe the necessity for recurring into the body of someone else with someone else in order to have the experiences of earth - and all kind of other theories one can have about that but at least it is logical.

Now you see that man as he is being born is at that moment as child the neutralizing force between the positive and negative as represented by father and mother. And that in the moment of conception

he has his chance you might say as a neutralizer being born with an opportunity for development. Which, when he is very young, particularly during the period of gestation and not as yet affected by all the different influences of earth - still, as a possibility then during that period to be completely free, not only choose but to live in accordance with the rules for further possible development. This is neutralizing force becoming on the next level the positive influence. Whenever a child is born and it is then part of earth, gradually the earth will take care of covering it up. And that, as you might say, is unfortunate because it is inherent in the fact that he was born on earth because that's the condition for thecontinuation of living on earth. If he knew too much, he wouldn't want to live. Earth covers him. Mother Nature covers him, clothes him, puts nice little clothes on and makes them very dark at times and surely not transparent. So that man as he is now living and he reaches maturity at the time that he would be able to do something about his own life - at that time, he's not doing anything and he doesn't know it. And as a result all his sexual energy will go into procreative form instead of being used for the real creation for himself of other bodies. At the same time, when someone realizes that that is the case and that he has the responsibility for that form of energy, that then that energy being of the highest value digestion in man is exactly the kind of energy to be used for the building of higher being bodies. And if one only knew this and knew it from the beginning as a child and not lose that as a necessity of obligation - that that man then at the time of maturity when all his different organs have been sufficiently developed could use a tremendous quantity of that material for the development of his own soul.

Now you see where does freedom come in? To free that what is in man as his life, each living cell has in it a surrounding which allows that what is life to continue to exist. Life is God. Life is magnetic center. Life is essential essence. So when one talks about what is in sperm, it is life, as God. Same as female. Not until they are connected will a form be made and from that moment

that part of God - it has become apart from God, you see. There is the difficulty. Because life as it is doesn't matter where it is - it has no bounds and it has no dimensions. When it is in connection and according to the law of duality upon earth has to be used for the formation of certain little bits of creatures who will continue the maintenance of earth, then it falls into that law and then it is only good to create another human being, hoping that such a human being might not forget the reason why it was born.

The real meaning of a birthday is to remind a person of the opportunities he had when he was born and that always one should drink when a person has a birthday to his possible evolution. That belongs to him as his birthright. But is is forgotten. We say another year is added. It is just too bad. Because another year added in unconnsciousness will make it much more difficult for man to go out. Do you understand now? Total picture of life going through a human being and what happens - particularly before life. This is always the stumbling block. We know a little bit about death and we can philosophize about it but what was life before death? And before conception? And that, as I said, is so seldom understood. All right?

Marjorie Corbett: Man is evolving on earth and the earth isn't evolving but the universe is. And this way . . .

Mr. Nyland: No, no. Ray of Creation is such a thing that we don't know. All we know is a little bit of a section which we call earth and a few planets around it and our sun. This we call solar system. That's about all we know. The rest, what we know about the universe is a few stars here and there in certain constellations which apparently do not change though I say Orion or ( ) whatever it might be but we don't know much about it only with a little telescope and we gather information and data.

That what concerns us is another solar system. Now let's rotate the book: when it is in a certain place in the Cosmic Ray. Now, what is the question?

Marjorie: Man, humanity is evolving. . .
Mr. Nyland: Not evolving.
Marjorie: Well, isn't it evolving in consciousness to another level?
Mr. Nyland: Absolutely not. Man is bound by the place where he lives. The earth happens to be at a place where it cannot go over to sol. It has to stay at fa. Only after many years of growth in an involutionary side - that is, from Absolute towards Anoolios, when Anoolios because of its growing point will form another little moon as a ( ), then earth moves up one place. And in that case, the earth will go over to the level of a planet and become a real planet. Then it is out of the fa and it will go through the planetary stage: the next one would be sol. The earth is still just a little bit above mi: do-re-mi - half a note, that's earth. Then a full one and to come to sol. That whole range is planetary condition. Planetary conditions in the cosmic scale simplay means there is an emotional state which can be useful either for growing up or going down. That is the idea, you might say. Now, that what applies to earth applies to man. Man in his own state is also an unfortunate planet. Not fullgrown at all and unless something happens to him he will never grow up. And when man, being born on earth, does not know anything about ordinary life or possible conscious life - he will simply die and whatever there was on earth. ( ).

Man has no Soul. He may wish one but he has to Work for it. If man could live long enough then because of maturity as a result of experience with all different types of people with whom he would come in contact, man would develop certain ideas and also realizations of consciousness. Because he would gradually, in that kind of relationship with other people start to understand the value of them and of himself and would eliminate much of his subjectivity. He could become conscious but he would need seven or eight hundred years for it. He doesn't have it. So man is ( ). How can he become conscious? For that reason, he is looking for a catalyst that will speed up this particular process of changing over from an unconscious state into a conscious one.

This means Work and Mother Nature is not helping him. Mother

Nature has a task to keep the earth where it is in order to use that what is organic kingdom on earth as a converting station in order to feed a little moon and to feed Anoolios. To maintain with other words the universe for whatever it is. So for that reason, man in his ordinary unconscious state only consists of his physical body up to si. If you overbridge it from si to do, he dies. So he lives at si. He has do-re-mi of feeling center in him. That he has a point - do - of an intellect - that helps him, as I say many times, to cross the street.

But otherwise it is not very emotional and it is not very intellectual; moreover, that whole bunch of this stuff in man is completely identification. That is the unfortunate part of the condition of earth and that it happens to be because he happens to be a man on earth. And he has become that way because the conditions of events are that way. And they have forced him as a personality to unite everything that is originally meant as centers to be kept separate. We are completely identified. By identification I mean that they are part of each other. Sometimes one says: they take in each other's washing.

A feeling center cannot live without a physical body. Much of that what takes place in the mind is translated in activity of the physical body. And sometimes the mind and the feeling disagree. But in any event, they know each other and they are pretty tied together. This is what I call inner identification. Inner partiality. The purpose of Work is to separate them so that the centers can start to function again as they were functioning in a young child. Or as they are functioning with a man in a restful state, when he actually is resting. That is, he had completely taken away from him all strains; his mind is free ( ) body. This particular state which is reached during sleep is really the ideal state for man and it is given to him to illustrate what he should become. But when he is asleep, physically, and wakes up, there is no "I" to govern. So for that reason he never gets anywhere because immediately from his physical sleep he goes over to his waking-sleeping state and that's the end.

That what man is potentially is the loosening of the si-do

physically so that he could be free from his physical body, the sol-la-si, the second part of the Kesdjan body which is the conscious state of his emotions and the third is really the full development of his Soul body. So that, on the present time, on the line which separates unconscious from conscious is potentiality.

Work simply means that one opens the three gates and the possible growth will start, linking on this, linking on that, and linking on the third. There's no question of rotating. And nothing circles around anything else. It happens that the moon does it around the earth and the earth goes around the sun, earth does it around itself. If you want to, you can use it as a nice psychological explanation of what man really is because he is ( ) exactly the same thing. He turns to the sun at times, he turns to dark moments at times, he turns to the moon at times, he's just rotating as he possibly can be. There's nothing permanent in man of that kind and nothing stationary. He's all the time unsure and he is all the zigzagging. There is no man with a definite aim. And no man understands even that he should have an aim. All the aim is resulting from physical body and the development of that. And if it is mind and if it is feeling, it is usually for other purposes: pride and vanity and respect and admiratïon and things of that kind which ( ). Does that answer more less?

Marjorie: Well I wanted to ask a question in connection with that. Whether it was possible for conscious men to exist before Christ. And that Christ brought...

Mr. Nyland: Ah, let me say it this way: I remain my Christ. The physical man? Jesus?

Marjorie: The teachings of Christ.

Mr. Nyland: Of course they existed. I think there were conscious men in the time of Buddha.

Marjorie: There must have been.

Mr. Nyland: Of course. Conscious men always have existed. When you say Christ - Christ is the method. Christ is the means of

becoming free. That is Christ. Not Jesus. Jesus was the man, reincarnating Christ. Christ is the means to reach God. That is why one says you have to have that kind of a mediator. It is not necessary to see Jesus Christ. It is necessary to manifest Christ as such, the redeemer in one. But as long as humanity has lived there have been conscious men. And originally, the earth was not in such bad condition. It only became bad when it was for some reason or other split off. Perhaps that the ( ). It was in the line of its own Cosmic Ray. And when it was the last point created, it was below the line of its own consciousness but it had a possibility of remaining that what it was and there was no necessity for man to appear.

Man had to appear on earth when earth, because of involution, reached the state of re. And that then for the continuation of further evolution something had to be created which then could become transforming station across the fa bridge. Before that, it was not necessary because there was no fa bridge. Originally in the development there is no octave. There are equal parts. I don't want to go too much in detail about that but the whole idea of the fa bridge is the shift. The shifting over - Gurdjieff explains it - when it was made Heptaparaparshinokh. It is the shift over the sol-la-si, half a note, and because of that the si-do becomes compressed and the fa is extended. And that what is necessary in order to help maintain each other when there was more than one Cosmic Ray - they everything became dependent on each other in order to maintain. it.

So as far as a person being conscious, everybody was conscious, wll, as soon as they existed. Because they had the time to become conscious. It's only gradually that time, for man, (has ( ) was reduced. That people had no chance and that they took on that what was you might call it the atmosphere of the earth - again at a place where they were unfortunate. And because of that,nobody was conscious. And it got so bad that they killed each other. And for that reason, it being seen

that they became a menace for the maintenance of the universe, something had to be done to them in order either to stop it - stop the killing each other - or to plant what is called organ Kundabuffer in them in order to make them see things upside down. That they wouldn't see the reality, the purpose being that they had to continue to exist on earth in order to help maintain it. And if they didn't, they by themselves would either disappear or they had to become conscious on their own. They would not fulfill that function of life on earth. Don't let's go further than that because it doesn' really matter.

Consciousness has always existed and always has existed before Jesus ever appeared and there are many many people that have lived who by this time I would say have reached heaven. And need not even ( ) and have become part of the totality of eternity.

Marjorie: Well do the Souls of the men who die just convert to energy or is there an increase in negative forces at all?

Mr. Nyland: No. From the standpoint of infinity there is no negative or positive. It's only if you happen to be on earth. Outside, already, objectivity, there is no negativity any more. This is all existence. There is no reason or no need for that. Only when you come across the fa-then you have a positive or negative. The split takes place at the moment when one crosses the fa bridge. The do-re-mi must be negative and positive. The so-la-si has no need because that there is being and t that is why if one describes the Sould on the different constellations, like Karatas, it is quite different. They are not human beings in our se sense of the word.

But now we get a little bit too close to how many angels can be on the top of a pin. Is it the end? It must be somehow or other. That is always an indication that I should stop. Isn't it? Well practically. You see I run out of breath after an hour.

End.